

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

Cheryl Jenett Thomas, )  
Plaintiff, ) C/A No. 5:14-2396-TMC  
vs. )  
Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting )  
Commissioner of Social Security, )  
Defendant. ) **ORDER**

Plaintiff Cheryl Jenett Thomas (“Thomas”) brought this action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying his claim for disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income under the Social Security Act. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the United States Magistrate Judge, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C. (ECF No. 40). The magistrate judge noted that Thomas failed to file a brief by an extended deadline and has not communicated with the court. (*Id.* at 2). The Report recommends that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). *Id.* Neither party has filed any objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough and careful review of the record, the court adopts the Report of the Magistrate Judge which is incorporated herein by reference. It appears that Thomas no longer wishes to prosecute this action. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982). *See Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

April 20, 2015  
Anderson, South Carolina